

REMARKS

Pursuant to entry of this Amendment, claims 1-4, 6, 9, 12-14, 24, 26-28 and 32-36 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 7, 8, 10, 11, 15-23 and 29-31 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and claims 35 and 36 have been newly added.

Summary of the Rejections

Claims 1-4, 6-14, 24-27 and 29-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Di Giulio et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,242,314) in view of Mohri et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,808,114). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 1, 9 and 24 recite a mold part that extends along the cable at greater distance than the connector housing in a direction of the extension of the cable. For example, the non-limiting embodiment of Fig. 3 of the present application discloses a mold part 9 extending along the cable a greater distance than the connector housing 6a in a direction of the extension of the cable. In asserting that Di Giulio teaches a mold part which extends along the cable a greater distance than the connector housing, the Examiner appears to think that the alleged mold part 24 extends farther than the alleged housing 20 in a direction orthogonal to the direction of the wires (*see, e.g., Di Giulio Fig. 2*). However, even if the Di Giulio mold part 24 extends farther than the housing 20 in some manner, it does not extend farther than the housing 20 *in a direction of the extension of the cable* (*see, e.g., Figs. 8 and 9*). Mohri is cited only for multiple connectors. Even if the Examiner's assertions regarding Mohri were correct, it would not correct this deficiency of Di Giulio. Accordingly, Applicant submit that claims 1, 9 and 24 are allowable over the combined teachings of Di Giulio.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111
U.S. APPLN. NO. 10/668,309
Docket No. Q77243

Claims 2-4 and 6 depend from claim 1, claims 12 and 14 depend from claim 9 and claims 25-27, 32 and 34 depend from claim 24. Accordingly, claims 2-4, 6, 12, 14, 25-27, 32 and 24 are allowable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

Claims 13 and 33 recite that two cut surfaces are bent so as not to contact or face each other. For example, the non-limiting embodiment of Fig. 12A illustrates cut surfaces 4j1a and 4j2a being bent so that they do not face one another. In contrast, as shown in Di Giulio Fig. 9, the cut surfaces of the Di Giulio wire 18a are not bent as claimed. Instead, Di Giulio teaches that the wires are prevented from bending downwardly (column 10, lines 28-34). This deficiency is not corrected by Mohri, which is cited only for multiple connectors as discussed above. Accordingly, claims 13 and 33 are allowable at least because the combined teachings and suggestions of Di Giulio and Mohri fail to disclose cut surfaces which are bent so as not to contact or face one another, as claimed.

New Claims

Claims 35 and 36 have been newly added herewith. Claim 35 depends from claim 13 and claim 36 depends from claim 33. Accordingly, claims 33 and 35 are allowable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111
U.S. APPLN. NO. 10/668,309
Docket No. Q77243

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER


Stephen R. Valancius
Registration No. 57,574

Date: April 17, 2007